



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

circumstances" without the camp (p. 168); the "house of God" in Judges and Samuel is identified with the tent of meeting (p. 172); "There are no good grounds for disputing the genuineness of Exod. 15" (p. 100; cf. 265. Has Dr. Orr really studied the tense sequence in this passage?); "The festal tithe of Deuteronomy is different from, and additional to, the ordinary tithe for the maintenance of the Levites" (p. 275); the phrase "beyond Jordan" as used in Deuteronomy does not necessarily imply a west-Jordan standpoint (!) (pp. 281 ff.); the fourth empire in Daniel is the Roman (pp. 536 ff.)! These illustrations, which are all taken from crucial points in the debate, suggest the question whether Dr. Orr's position would not ultimately compel a return to the old harmonistic method of interpreting Scripture, and whether this reversion is at all probable? Scientific exegesis raised the problem of the Old Testament. The study of comparative religions has accentuated it. Dr. Orr's exegesis does not inspire confidence, and he shows little sympathy with the attempt to observe the biblical phenomena in the atmosphere created by the latter study. The above considerations compel us to share in the doubt of the author when he confesses that he "entertains no oversanguine expectation as to its [the book's] effect on general conviction;" but we would also share in his "hope that it may at least rouse to reflection some who have given too easy an assent to current theories" (p. xvii). As a critique of present criticism it certainly challenges a respectful and a studied reply.

The notes on pp. 362-77 do not agree in their sequence with those on pp. 522-27.

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN, OHIO

SOME COMMENTARIES ON THE PROPHETS

Commentaries on prophetic books of the Old Testament representing three distinct types lie before us. Professor von Orelli¹ is a representative of the older school of exegetes of the class of Delitzsch—those who have ever been open-minded, and scholarly, eminent in learning, and yet not profoundly original. Thus in the volumes of von Orelli we find evinced sound historical and grammatical exegesis, and a full knowledge of the literature of his subject; and yet a failure to fall into line with some

¹ *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Ausgelegt von C. von Orelli. Dritte, neu durchgearbeitete Auflage. München: Beck, 1904. vi + 228 pages. M. 3.50.

Der Prophet Jeremia. Übersetzt und ausgelegt von C. von Orelli. Dritte, neu durchgearbeitete Auflage. München: Beck, 1905. vi + 216 pages. M. 3.50.

(Both of these volumes belong to Strack & Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments*.)

of the most notable recent achievements in biblical scholarship: for whatever may have been the excesses of Duhm's application of the principles of Hebrew rhythm in his epoch-making commentary upon Isaiah, it is certain that no one in the future can suitably present the Book of Isaiah as a product of Hebrew prophetic literature without in translation exhibiting the poetic parallelisms, if not also strophical divisions. Professor von Orelli, however, in this third edition has hardly made an endeavor in this direction, but has given us the German text of Isaiah printed as in the former editions, entirely in the form of prose.

Von Orelli remains also extremely conservative in the matter of introduction. He repudiates the notion that the Book of Isaiah is in any way an anthology of prophecies, but with slight hesitation assigns chaps. 1—32 almost entirely to Isaiah. He has, however, modified his views considerably in this third edition compared with his first—published some nineteen years ago and translated into English. In that he held to the Isaianic authorship of the oracles concerning Babylon (chaps. 13—14:23), concerning Edom and the redemption of Israel (chaps. 34, 35), and of the Apocalypse (chaps. 24—27). With this conservatism in introduction remains an almost slavish adherence in translation to the Massoretic text. For example, in the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah there is retained in vs. 7 the reading **מִשׁוּרֵי עִם עוֹלָם וְאַחֲרֵיהֶן**, although the clearly preferable reading of Oor *et al.*, **מִי הַשָּׁמַיִם מֵעוֹלָם אַחֲרֵיהֶן**, is mentioned in a note; and in vs. 8 **בִּלְיָדְעִי** is retained, although it is clearly a dittography of **מִבְּלַעֲדִי** which has been misplaced. Again in vs. 16 **חֲצִי**,² another clear dittography, has been retained instead of **כְּחֹלִים** after the Greek version. And—to give a single example from Jeremiah—in 17:13 **יִכְתְּבוּ** is retained without even noticing the reading **יִכְלְמוּ** given by Ewald, Cornill, and Duhm as a ready suggestion of the parallelism.

Professor Marti² is representative of the advanced school of commentators, and is to be classed with Professors Duhm and Cheyne, although less original and less given to extravagances in textual emendation and in interpretation. The most marked feature of this school is, first, subjective textual emendation based upon Hebrew parallelism and rhythm; and, secondly, the view that our present prophecies have been largely edited in the interests of post-exilic Judaism, so that in many instances the messages of hope and salvation, which have usually been regarded

² *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament: Dodekapropheten*. Erklärt von Karl Marti. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr; 1. Hälfte 1903. 2. Hälfte 1904. 492 pages M. 8.

as the most significant and original sayings of the prophets, are now assigned to later periods. Thus in the volume before us we are told:

Hosea threatens the Israelites with pitiless judgment. God calls upon death and Sheol with all their pangs to prepare an end for the people. Jehovah is the holy one whom no human suffering weakens [in his wrath]. The sections containing prophecies of salvation not only from their contents do not fit into the circle of Hosea's thought, but they interrupt in a disturbing manner the threats of calamity or weaken their meaning.

Moreover, Professor Marti holds that these passages more or less presuppose the exile and are dependent in a measure upon the later prophets, especially Isaiah. Thus he regards as additions to Hosea the following: 2:1-3 (1:10-2:1), 15b-25(2:13b-23); 3:1-5 (entire chapter); 5:15-6:3, 5b; 11:10 f.; 14:2-10. Accordingly, the gospel is eliminated from the message of Hosea, and the glory of the vision of the bottomless love and compassion of Jehovah is given to some later Jewish editor. We do not accept this. We regard it in the highest degree improbable that any prophets of Israel spoke messages of judgment unrelieved by messages of salvation. To pronounce doom only is not worth the effort, and we do not believe that the school of criticism represented by Marti, Duhm, and Cheyne, and to which President Harper in his commentary upon Hosea gave his adherence, will in the end stand over against the more conservative position represented by Canon Driver and Professor George Adam Smith.

In other particulars we have only commendation for the comments of Professor Marti. He divides the material of the prophets into strophes and gives many grammatical references and mentions just enough authorities in recent commentators of the critical school which he represents. Thus he fulfils most excellently the purpose of the series of commentaries to which his work belongs, and which aims at nothing encyclopedic, but only to enable one to interpret correctly the Hebrew text.

In Père Condamin's³ "Book of Isaiah" we have a commentary representing neither the backward conservatism of Professor von Orelli nor the radicalism of Professor Marti, but midway between them, presenting in the main the soundness and sanity reflected so largely in the works of Driver, G. A. Smith, and Skinner. Père Condamin, however, is an independent scholar, who handles the text freely and is untrammelled in his use of the textual emendations furnished by Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti. In matters of introduction he is more conservative

³ *Etudes bibliques: Le livre d'Isaïe*. Traduction critique avec notes et commentaire. Par Albert Condamin. Paris: Lecoffre, 1905. xix+400 pages.

than these last-mentioned scholars, refusing to follow them in ascribing so very much of the Book of Isaiah to post-exilic writers. The full discussion of the questions of introduction is, however, reserved for another volume. In Père Condamin's exegesis one sees little trace of any bias from his Roman Catholic faith until we come to 7:14, where a direct reference to the Virgin Mary is preserved by suggesting the rendering of "Behold" [הנה] as a conditional particle, *Suppose que*. And he closes a full discussion of the Servant of Yahweh of Isa., chap. 53, with these words:

Concluons. L'ancienne tradition de l'Eglise et la plupart des exégètes ont eu raison de reconnaître dans le Serviteur de Iahvé le Messie des Evangiles, et de voir dans les quatre passages en question une prédicament direct de son œuvre de ses souffrances, de sa mort et de son règne universel.

But the striking feature of this work is a graceful and vigorous translation, preserving the parallelism of Hebrew poetry especially, dividing the text into strophes. In this latter feature the author follows in the line of the theories advanced by Dr. H. Müller (*Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, Vienna, 1896) and J. K. Zenner (*Die Chorgesänger im Buche der Psalmen*, Freiburg 1896). Hebrew poetry, he holds, had a strophical structure in which a strophe whose size varies from 3 or 4 verses (not lines) to 7, 8, 10 verses, and so on, is followed by a symmetrical antistrophe. If a strophe is composed of 7 verses grouped according to the meaning thus, 3, 2, 2, then the antistrophe will have the same number of verses in symmetrical or parallel groups, 2, 2, 3 or 3, 2, 2. After the strophe and the antistrophe comes an intermediate strophe composed of parts symmetrical to each other; thus, 2, 2, 3, 3 or 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, or 3, 2, 2, 3, etc. (never 3, 2, nor 3, 2, 2, nor 3, 3, 2, etc.). Then again come the strophe and antistrophe; and if the poem is still longer, the series is repeated in the same order—intermediate strophe, antistrophe, etc., to the end. The strophes are determined by the principal thought developed, by the symmetry of the number of verses and groups of verses between consecutive strophes and antistrophes, and by the repetition of certain words at the beginning and end of strophes. The intermediate strophe expresses threatenings, invitations to repentance, or messianic promises. On these principles the entire book of Isaiah (excepting, of course, the historical sections and a few other passages which are plainly prose), is divided into poems subdivided into strophes, whose titles are given in italics and whose catchwords are printed in heavy type. All of this appeals strongly to the eye. But we are far from being convinced that any real law of strophical structure underlies Hebrew poetry. Each

verse is in one sense a strophe in itself, and the verses lend themselves readily into an almost infinite variety of grouping, as appears at once when one will divide passages of Hebrew poetry or prophecy into short paragraphs. Given now, with the thought of paragraphing, a variety of assumptions upon which paragraphs may be made, and then again the liberty, which Père Condamin and others frequently take, of varying the order of verses, it becomes evident that the development of a system of strophes is more a work of ingenuity than the discovery of a real guiding principle used in composition by the Hebrew poets.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL
New Haven, Conn.

EDWARD L. CURTIS

THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The new importance which the historical method is assuming in theology has of late appeared in a number of German publications. Among them is the discriminating essay of Dr. Carl Clemen, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode in der Theologie*.¹ Though but an address, it grasps the center of the real historical problem in Christianity and indicates the significance of both the comparative and the genetic methods in the study of the New Testament. Dr. Clemen is not ready to accept all the conclusions of Gunkel, but at the same time he recognizes and insists that the dependence of New Testament thought upon other religions must be recognized. In this recognition, however, he very strongly affirms that it will be found that nothing really essential to Christian teaching has been surrendered. While in an address it is impossible for him to handle the literature in detail, he has in a very striking fashion brought together the chief positions of the different representatives of the new method.

The address is valuable, however, not merely as an orientation in literature, but particularly in its caution against excessive zeal in the discovery of the origins of Christianity in Judaism. A particularly happy illustration is his brief discussion of the origin of the Lord's Supper and his note upon one of Feine's sweeping statements. Christianity, with all its historical dependence, is certainly something more than a patchwork of Jewish and Hellenistic practices.

Martin Brückner² states that he began his study of the origin of the

¹ *Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode in der Theologie*. Von Carl Clemen. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1904. 39 pages.

² *Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie*. Von Martin Brückner. Strassburg: Heitz, 1903. 237 pages. M. 5.